REMARKS

Counsel for Applicants wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephone interview, the substance of which is incorporated in these Remarks. For the reasons expressed at the interview, and in view of the present amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the claims distinguish over the cited art and are allowable. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

During the interview, it was pointed out that neither of the cited patents discloses or suggests a method, a storage switch or a linecard for a storage switch in a storage network that classifies packets as data packets or as control packets for controlling the storage switch without buffering the packets.

In particular, Buckman discloses a broadband node for a "best efforts" network that classifies packets based upon ATM fields, IP source or destination addresses, port numbers, protocol type (DNS, DHCP, etc.), into groups according to flow, bandwidth, etc., to provide different levels of service to users (see col. 4, ln. 51 – col. 5, ln. 15). Buckman does not disclose control packets as comprising connection requests or storage management requests. Moreover, while Buckman discloses that packets are processed at linespeed at the ingress ports and egress points of an intranet (col. 4, lns. 9-12), this does not disclose or suggest classification of packets without buffering, as claimed. In fact, Buckman explicitly discloses that while the parallel path processing of the disclosed node processes packets at high speed, the control path performs more complex logic at lower

speeds (see col. 4, lns. 29-34), implying that the classification of packets does not occur at linespeed (or without buffering).

Hu discloses a switch in a storage network, but does not disclose packet classification without buffering. In fact, Hu (in Fig. 2 and col. 7 lns. 20-30) discloses that the switch includes multiple buffers, including for buffering the packets for decoding higher layer protocols, suggesting that eh switch does not classify packets without buffering, as claimed.

At the interview, the Examiner indicated that amending the claims to specify that the control packets comprise connection requests or storage management requests, as described in the specification, would define control packets more specifically and would distinguish over the cited art.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 16, 24, 44, 50 and 53 have been amended to define the control packets as comprising connection requests or storage management requests, as suggested by the Examiner.

Thus, it is submitted that all independent claims distinguish over the cited art to Buckman and Hu, and that these claims are allowable over the cited art. The dependent claims similarly distinguish over the cited art for at least the same reasons the independent claims distinguish, and are likewise deemed allowable.

Claims 31-43 and 54-63, which were withdrawn pursuant to a restriction requirement have been cancelled.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and early allowance of all claims is solicited.

If, upon consideration of this Amendment, any outstanding issued remain that are amenable to correction, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned prior to taking further action.

Dated: December 10, 2008

Respectfully Submitted,

/Barry N. Young/

_____

Barry N. Young
Attorney for Assignee
Reg. No. 27,744

Customer No. 80280
Law Offices of Barry N. Young
200 Page Mill Road, Suite 102
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2061
Phone: (650) 326-2701
Fax: (650) 326-2799
byoung@young-iplaw.com